



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Louise D. FARRAND et al.

Examiner: P.L. Nordmeyer

Serial No.: 09/654,516

Group Art Unit: 1772

Filed: September 1, 2000

Title: MULTIREACTIVE POLYMERIZABLE MESOGENIC COMPOUNDS

AEJ/12/102
#8/12/02
RECEIVED
NOV 29 2002
TC 1700 MAIL ROOM

RESPONSE TO SECOND RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated November 15, 2002, Applicants hereby elect with traverse Group I (claims 1-10) drawn to compounds.

Applicants are somewhat confused about the issuing of this new restriction requirement because a restriction requirement was already mailed September 16, 2002, and responded to by Applicants on October 16, 2002. Thus, applicants first grounds for traversal are that the PTO should revert back to their original restriction and applicants original election of the invention of claims 1-13. This should include considering applicants' traversal of that restriction and withdrawal of the restriction on that basis. In any event, for the reasons further stated below, there should be no restriction amongst any of the claims in this application.

Claims 1-10 are directed to a polymerizable compound, claim 11 to a composition containing this compound, claims 12 and 13 to a polymer prepared by polymerizing this compound and claims 14-16 to an article comprising such polymer. These inventions are clearly related and closely intertwined. Every claim ultimately depends upon claim 1 and, thus, requires the particulars thereof.

The allegations in the Office Action that combination claims 14-16 do not require the particulars of claims 1-10, claim 11 or claims 12-13 is incorrect. Claims 14-16 require a polymer of claims 12-13 prepared by polymerizing the exact compounds of claims 1-10 or composition of